

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 4

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

March 1, 1980

## Pitfalls for Academe in New CIA Charter

There's a lot at stake for university researchers in the current campaign to remove restrictions that were placed on government intelligence operations in the aftermaths of Watergate and Vietnam. But academe—which could find itself tied in knots by some of the proposals now gaining support—has been more or less indifferent to these possible changes.

Following revelations in the 1970s that the Central Intelligence Agency had been undertaking illegal activities at home and abroad, Congress imposed various restrictions on intelligence operations. But with the CIA accumulating support for a return to its old ways of doing business, the restrictions—none of them actually very onerous or unreasonable—are under heavy fire.

Among the most controversial of the proposals now before Congress are reductions in the number of Congressional committees to which the CIA must report;

involving the CIA's secret mind-control and behavior-modification projects of the 1950s and 1960s. The full details of the projects, codenamed MK-ULTRA, will never be known because many of the CIA files have been destroyed. After the Rockefeller Commission and the Church Committee brought the project to light in 1975 and 1976, the CIA miraculously recovered some 8000 documents on the projects. These showed that 80 organizations and institutions and 185 researchers had been involved in 149 mind-control projects between 1953 and 1966.

Some of the projects may have been, as the CIA contends, "comparatively innocuous in nature." But at least some of the 149 projects involved methods in direct violation of what are widely regarded as minimal ethical

(Continued on Page 2)

## Science Academy Puts Freeze on Soviet Ties---Page 4

limitations on the type of information it must provide to Congress, and elimination of many of the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), the law that makes government documents accessible to the public.

The CIA's yearning to throw off the new rules was spelled out in recent hearings before the House and the Senate. As might be expected, the CIA's proposals are opposed by the usual anti-intelligence groups, most notably the Campaign for Political Rights (formerly the Campaign to Stop Government Spying). A few scholarly research organizations have begun new discussions of CIA infiltration on campus and several dozen universities are talking about formulating statements that would advise faculty members not to cooperate with the CIA in secret activities. A few universities have even given their okays to some fairly strong-sounding resolutions.

For the most part, however, the efforts to control CIA activities on campus have been the work of political scientists and historians, while few laboratory-type scientists seem concerned about the political and ethical snags that accompany intelligence-sponsored activities on campus.

Past abuses are evident in a case now before the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

## In Brief

The President has asked NSF Director Richard Atkinson and Education Secretary Shirley Hufstedler to collaborate on a comparative study of Soviet and American science and engineering education. The object, according to a White House science aide, is to provide guidance on relative standings and long-term trends, particularly in view of the massive numbers of scientists and engineers that the Soviets are producing. The NSF-Ed report is due by July 1.

*The Association of American Medical Colleges is cool toward an attempt to rate the 10 best and 10 worst of its 126 member institutions. "Private Practice," a conservative journal for physicians, asked medical deans to rate the best and the worst. But AAMC President John A. D. Cooper urged them not to reply, arguing that "There is no way, because of the diversity of our medical schools with each making its own contribution in educating physicians, conducting biomedical research and improving health care, to intelligently determine which is the best and which is the worst school in the country."*

*Arts and Books, an offshoot of the highly successful Chronicle of Higher Education, has suspended publication after 12 issues because of "disappointing" subscription sales.*

*R&D expenditures in the US—from all sources—should hit \$61 billion this year, according to the Battelle Memorial Institute. After adjusting for inflation, that's a boost of about 7 per cent.*

## ... CIA Chief Wants Right to Use Academics

(Continued from Page 1)

standards for scientific inquiry. Some of the MK-ULTRA projects, for example, involved the use of unwitting subjects in mind-altering drug experiments. As a result of these experiments, at least two deaths occurred.

While acknowledging that the use of drugs and related agents in intelligence operations is "distasteful," the CIA continues to argue that the MK-ULTRA project was necessary to combat a perceived threat to the nation's security.

The CIA contends it stopped the MK-ULTRA project in 1966 but is reluctant to identify all the projects' participants. Thus far, the agency has released the names of only 59 institutions. It has steadfastly refused to disclose the names of the remaining 21 universities or to mention any of the individual researchers.

As a result of this reticence, John Cary Sims and Sidney M. Wolfe of the Nader Public Citizens Group last year filed suit for the information under the FOIA. After hearing the case, US District Court Judge Louis F. Oberdorfer agreed with the Nader lawyers and ordered the CIA to make full disclosure of the institutions and individuals associated with MK-ULTRA.

Considerably more harm than good could result from disclosure of the names of individual researchers, the CIA lawyers said. Not only could disclosure "substantially harm" the agency's ability to develop intelligence sources, the CIA contended, but it could also damage the reputations of many scientists.

"The disclosure of the researchers' names," the CIA told the Appeals Court, "may seriously affect their careers and other personal relationships, causing both embarrassment and public harrassment."

While awaiting the court's decision, the CIA has made it clear that it will not rely on the judiciary to free itself from restrictions. The CIA will appeal the case to the lawmakers themselves.

At a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Governmental Information and Individual Rights,

Frank C. Carlucci, Deputy Director of the CIA, sharply criticized the FOIA and endorsed various proposals now before Congress that would exempt many of the CIA's files from search, review, and disclosure requirements of the FOIA. Under the provisions of the CIA charter now being considered by Congress, the only FOIA requests that would be honored by the CIA would be from individuals who wanted information on themselves.

In hearings before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, CIA Director Stansfield Turner went even further in urging Congress to provide similar relief for the National Security Agency, the FBI, and other intelligence organizations.

Turner said he also wants the authority to use universities, religious organizations, and whatever other special groups he needs, as cover for intelligence operations. The proposed CIA charter, S.2284, would not go far enough, Turner said, because it would only continue the current policy of allowing "voluntary contacts" and "voluntary exchange of information" between individual faculty members and intelligence agents.

The one hopeful sign in all of these efforts to reshape the CIA charter is that the White House and Congress are far from agreement. While the Administration would like to lift as many of the restrictions as possible, many lawmakers feel it is essential to have the CIA accountable to at least a few members of Congress.

Should there be strong enough protests from outside interest groups, it is possible that a vote on the new charter will be delayed indefinitely. Some organizations, such as the American Association of University Professors, have indicated their willingness to speak out. But opponents of the free-wheeling charter will have to move quickly, for in the wake of Iran and Afghanistan, there are many Congressmen ready to unleash the CIA.  
—Anne Roark

(The author is an Assistant Editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.)

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor  
**Anne Roark**

Editor and Publisher

**Daniel S. Greenberg**

Associate Publisher

**Wanda J. Reif**

European Correspondents

**Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguier (Paris)**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$89.50 (two years, \$168.50); individuals, \$48.50 (two years, \$82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Circulation Manager  
**Susan Burke**

## Congress Moves Closer to Patent Law Change

With lobbyists for academe and small business providing a big push, legislation to revise and harmonize the patchwork of patent rules followed by various government agencies is gaining considerable support on Capitol Hill.

A majority in both houses clearly favors reform of the present administrative chaos, in which at least 24 different and often contradictory patent policies exist in different federal agencies, but only a minority feels very inflamed about the issue. So, despite the revisionists' hopes, legislation could be derailed by disagreements about how generous a uniform patent policy should be.

Activity is further advanced in the Senate than in the House. S.414, sponsored by Senators Robert Dole (R-Kansas) and Birch Bayh (D-Indiana), was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee three months ago, and has reached the Senate floor. It gets to the heart of university and business complaints about current patent policies by allowing non-profit organizations and small firms to retain title to federally financed inventions and discoveries, except in a few special circumstances.

The Senate rejected, 60-34, an amendment by Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.) and Harrison Schmitt (R-N.M.)—the senior members of the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space—that would have extended the bill to all federal research contractors, including big business. But Senator Russell Long (D-La.) prevented a final vote. When the bill comes up again—any day now—Long, Chairman of the Finance Committee, is expected to use delaying tactics, if not a full-scale filibuster, against it. Like some consumer advocates, he takes the populist view that private organizations should not be allowed to profit from government-financed research.

That is a minority viewpoint (though coming from a Senator as powerful as Long it could be enough to sink the bill). Most Senators who have spoken on the issue believe that the current practice of many agencies—to retain title to the inventions they finance and make them available to almost anyone who wants to develop them—acts as a strong disincentive to innovation. The reason why only 4 per cent of the 28,000 patents in the government's patent portfolio have been used, they say, is that companies have not been prepared to incur development and marketing costs without the protection of an exclusive license. In cases where universities have managed to retain patent rights and could therefore offer exclusive licenses to developers, 33 per cent of patents have been licensed successfully, according to the Judiciary Committee's report on the Dole-Bayh bill.

However such simplistic comparisons do not really compare like with like. As an aide to the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee, which will soon hold hearings on patent policy, said: "There hasn't been

### *A Medal for Science "Statesmen"*

Spotting what it perceives as a medal gap, the National Science Foundation has rushed in with a new one—the Vannevar Bush Award, which, it has announced, will be given now and then to those who fit the category of "senior statesman of science and technology."

The award, named after the World War II research chief who recommended what eventually became NSF, is the geriatric counterpart to the Alan T. Waterman Award, which is NSF's youngster-of-the-year award. There is a big difference between the two, however, because the Waterman Award—named after NSF's founding director—carries with it a bundle of research money, while the Bush award will be in the medal-only category.

The Bush award was recommended by NSF Director Richard C. Atkinson and was approved by the National Science Board—NSF's policymaking body—on February 21. According to an NSF announcement, Board Chairman Norman C. Hackerman expressed the following opinion:

"The Vannevar Bush Award by the National Science Board will strengthen the public recognition of the contribution of scientists and engineers to our national welfare through public service." The Bush and Waterman awards, he added, "are designed to encourage individuals to seek to achieve the Nation's objectives in research."

NSF says that the award will be given "from time to time in May," and that nominations should be submitted to the National Science Board (1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550) by March 30.

any good research [on the subject]. A lot of it is just the subjective opinions of people who work in the field." Nevertheless, some opinions, such as those of HEW patent counsel Norman Latker about delays in developing new drugs for which his agency holds patent rights, is quite compelling.

Logically, it is hard to fault the Stevenson-Schmitt argument that, if patent protection is necessary for the development of inventions by small firms and nonprofit organizations, the same incentive should be extended to all federal contractors. As Stevenson said, arguing in the Senate for a really uniform federal patent policy, the Dole-Bayh bill "will require more unnecessary government regulations and red tape and it will penalize corporations for their success. As soon as they . . . are no longer considered small businesses they are deprived

*(Continued on Page 4)*

## Six-Month Soviet Freeze Voted by Academy

With the Soviets showing no sign of relenting in their abuse of Andrei Sakharov, the chill continues to deepen in US-USSR scientific relations. The latest development came February 25, when the Council of the US National Academy of Sciences announced a six-month suspension of all its bilateral symposia, seminars and workshops with the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The suspension, which the Academy pointed out as "unprecedented" in its two decades of dealings with its Soviet counterpart, will have an immediate effect on a symposium on laser-matter interactions that was scheduled to begin March 3 at the University of Arizona. Fifteen Soviet physicists and 20 Americans were to take part in that meeting. Three other meetings also fall within the suspension period. The NAS pointed out that the Council's decision does not apply to individual exchanges; nor, of course, does it affect Soviet-American exchanges outside of the inter-academy agreements.

The cutoff, which was cabled to A. P. Aleksandrov, President of the Soviet Academy, was inspired in large part by reports that Sakharov is to be stripped of his Academy membership when the organization meets on March 4. The NAS cable was signed by Saunders Mac

Lane, Vice President and Acting Chairman of the Council, in the absence of NAS President Philip Handler, who was in Hamburg, attending a Helsinki Convention meeting on scientific freedom and the rights of scientists.

Following are key excerpts from NAS Council statement:

"For two decades, the exchange program successfully survived shifting political tides. However, recently, it has been imperiled by several incidents. These incidents can be viewed from different perspectives which bear profoundly on the pursuit of science, political freedom, human rights, and, most importantly, the preservation of world peace.

"The cornerstone of Academy policy with respect to scientific exchange has been reliance on the sensitivity and voluntary decisions of individual US scientists. This policy will remain, but its execution will reflect our deep concerns with recent events, in particular, actions by the Soviet government with respect to our Foreign Associate, Academician Andrei D. Sakharov. These actions represent, from our perspective, an intrusion upon the

(Continued on Page 5)

### PATENTS (Continued from Page 3)

of exclusive title to government-financed inventions."

Many supporters of Dole-Bayh feel the same way, though they dare not argue publicly for an extension beyond universities and small companies, for fear of provoking more charges that private businesses would enrich themselves at the taxpayers' expense. "It's a case of the best being the enemy of the good," acknowledged Newton Cattell, Executive Director for Federal Relations at the Association of American Universities. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) was one Senator who said he would vote against patent protection for big business, even though he believes it would be beneficial, because "any expanded coverage of S.414 will result in its being killed in the House."

The Carter Administration favors a third approach, half way between Dole-Bayh and Stevenson-Schmitt. Universities and small business would retain the ownership of patents, while other contractors would be given only exclusive licenses in specified fields of use. No one in the Senate has yet agreed to sponsor the Administration's proposed legislation, but Rep. Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wisc.) expects to introduce it soon in the House.

In addition to keeping out big business, the Dole-Bayh bill and its companion measure (HR 2414), spon-

sored in the House by Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino (D-N.J.), contain other restrictions. One is the "pay back provision," which entitles the government to receive 15 per cent of licensing income above \$70,000 a year or up to 5 per cent of gross sales above \$1 million.

To some extent this is a cosmetic feature, as the Senate Judiciary Committee's report makes clear. "Although there is no evidence of 'windfall profits' having been made from any inventions that arose from federally-supported programs, the existence of the pay back provision reassures the public that their support is taken into consideration when these patentable discoveries are successful commercially."

The government would also have "march-in-rights" on patents, if the holder does not make enough effort to achieve practical application. And in "exceptional circumstances" the bill would allow an agency to go through a special procedure to keep the title to an invention, as for example when the funding agreement calls for a specific product to be used for regulation.

In short, any new federal patent policy written by Congress this year is likely to be a minor improvement to existing practice but not a major stimulus to industrial innovation—Clive Cookson

(The author is Washington correspondent of the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, London.)

## R&D Agencies Held Lacking on Job Equality

As the nation's single biggest employer of scientists and engineers, how well is the federal government itself complying with laws and regulations designed to improve job opportunities for women and Blacks?

The main difficulty with answering that question is that the available information is quite stale, and it takes some juggling and estimating to work out a plausible picture of the presentday situation. And that's what has to be done with the National Science Foundation's recently issued study "Sex and Ethnic Differentials in Employment and Salaries Among Federal Scientists and Engineers."

The data in that study are over three years old, but what they show—and it's still probably the case today—is that the federal R&D bureaucracy has not done a particularly commendable job in hiring and rewarding women and Blacks.

While it will probably take another two or three years before we know for certain whether the pattern is changing, it is instructive to use that old data to compare the employment record of the federal government with that of academe and industry. Looked at that way, it appears that the federal government has felt quite free to chastise and penalize other employers while itself falling short of the standards it has proclaimed for the entire nation.

Using data from the Civil Service Commission's central personal data file for 1977, NSF found that the feds had the second worst employment rate for women and only the second best employment rate for Blacks and other minority groups. That means that non-profit organizations, educational institutions, and even state and local governments were doing a far better job in hiring women, and that state and local governments have done a better job of hiring minority groups, than have federal agencies.

What's worse, according to the NSF findings, is that women scientists and engineers who were hired through the Civil Service Commission had received only about

### ACADEMY (*Continued from Page 4*)

human rights and scientific activities of an eminent scientist. The consequences of such actions have been emphasized by President Handler in his 1973 and 1980 statements on these matters.

"We believe that there is no long-term national benefit in modifying scientific exchanges in response to every political action and reaction, and we have so indicated to the US government. But we are keenly aware of the reaction of American scientists and the American public to the actions of the Soviet government."

Among major sectors of the economy, the Federal Government ranks next to last in the proportion of its female S/E [Science/Engineering] work force. Almost 9000 (5.1 per cent) of the 170,000 scientists and engineers in the Federal service in October 1977 were women, a percentage which exceeds only the 3.5 per cent of female scientists and engineers in the business and industry sector in 1976, the closest year for which comparable data are available.

When these S/E employment figures are further cross-classified by occupational group, other distinctions are observable. Among these is the small proportion of women employed as engineers; only in State and local governments do women make up more than 1 per cent of the engineering work force. This low participation of women in engineering in all sectors, along with the heavy representation of engineers in the S/E work force (62 per cent of the total), contributes to the low percentage of women in the total S/E population.

An examination of the data for scientists alone shows that women make up 10 per cent of the Federal work force, the lowest of any sector tabulated. This small fraction of women scientists in the Federal Government can in part be attributed to the low percentage of women life scientists in this sector.

*From "Sex and Ethnic Differentials in Employment and Salaries Among Federal Scientists and Engineers."*

three-quarters the salary that their male counterparts earned. Blacks and other minority groups did somewhat better, earning about nine-tenths the salary of white males.

While the federal government may be able to provide some explanations for many of these discrepancies only part of them can be explained by differences in experience, education, geographical locale, and the like.

The one hopeful sign that things aren't quite as bad today as they were three years ago is that the younger—and presumably more recently hired—women and blacks were doing somewhat better in 1977 than their older counterparts in the federal science and engineering job market.

Women, for example, represented only about 5 per cent of all scientists and engineers in the workforce in 1977, but they represented 27 and 15 per cent, respectively, of the two youngest age groups during that same year. For minority groups, NSF found, the pattern similar, though much less striking.

*(Continued on Page 6)*

## Few Specifics in US-Japan Science Talks

That was a big pow-wow that the US and Japan held in Washington in mid-February on Cooperation in Research and Development in Science and Technology in Non-Energy fields. But though the combined delegations of the two countries numbered over 50 high-ranking research administrators and supporting staff, it is difficult to find much of a tangible nature that emerged from the two-day meeting.

A communique from the White House Science Office states that the "two sides expressed their intention to initiate a number of specific joint programs in the near future (and) discussed the draft text of an Agreement on Cooperation in Research and Development in Science and Technology, and stated their intention to sign it at an early date."

As for specifics, the White House announcement says that "The two sides expressed their intention to proceed" with various "joint research and development programs as the initial activities." But an SGR inquiry about who's paying how much for what brought the reply that money amounts are yet to be worked out. On a list, under the heading "Health," was "Center for Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Studies." An inquiry to the White House Science Office turned up a reply that no information was available on that item. Whereupon, inquiries to the innards of the Public Health Service finally got the following explanation: There was a long ago proposal for such a center, jointly supported by the US and Japan, to be located either at

the East West Center in Hawaii, or on the West Coast. But that was back in the days when Joe Califano ran HEW and he was keen for collaborative efforts with Japan; since then, the spirit seems to have diminished.

At present, there are no plans for anything that might reasonably be referred to as a "center," SGR was informed. Instead, there's talk of a small epidemiological alcoholism study, but that's about all.

The White House statement is quite effusive about US-Japan cooperation in R&D beyond the energy field—which is actually a booming collaborative enterprise, reflecting Japanese anxieties about their precarious energy situation. But in other fields of R&D, the thrust for collaboration is largely from the US, which has been complaining that the Japanese industrially exploit openly published Western research without making any major contributions of their own to the world's pool of scientific knowledge. It could be, given the paltry results of the February meeting, that Japanese simply do not share our enthusiasm for getting them to add to that pool.

The White House Science Office communique does have the flavor of much ado about nothing, as can be seen from its summation:

"The present meeting is recognized by the two sides as an important milestone in the development of a productive partnership for the 1980s—a goal for the two countries set at the May 1979 summit meeting in Washington between President Carter and Prime Minister Ohira. Mutually beneficial cooperation among the major developed countries such as the US and Japan is essential to the further progress of scientific and tech-

(Continued on Page 7)

## JOBS (Continued from Page 5)

"A critical question" in determining the future role of these underrepresented groups, the NSF report says, is whether these younger women and minorities will remain in federal service.

Although salary differentials did exist among these groups in federal science and engineering jobs, the differences were less dramatic than in non-government jobs. By taking into consideration such factors as training and experience, at least 60 per cent of the male-female differential could be explained, as could about one-third of the minority - non-minority differential.

NSF also found some evidence that there was less "unexplained" differences among the younger age groups, suggesting that the problem of salaries may also be less significant today than it was a few years ago.

(The report, "Sex and Ethnic Differentials in Employment and Salaries Among Federal Scientists and Engineers," 11 pages, is available for \$1 per copy from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402; specify Stock No. 038-000-00429-8.)

## In Print

"Science, Technology and the Human Prospect," essays by 21 participants in last April's Thomas A. Edison Centennial, in San Francisco, including Eric Hoffer, Philip Morrison, Simon Ramo, Philip Handler, and Jean-Jacques Saloman, edited by Chauncey Starr and Philip Ritterbush; Pergamon Press, New York, London, etc., 228 pages, \$60 hardcover, \$30 softcover.

"Technology on Trial: Public Participation in Decision-Making Related to Science and Technology," report of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, discusses various public controversies involving scientific and technological components; 122 pages, \$7, OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20006; tel: (202) 724-1857.

## ●...A Polite Communique is the Main Product

(Continued from Page 6)

nological research and development. This new partnership promises the production of greater results than either side could achieve separately in a number of scientific and technological areas which exceed any one nation's economic and manpower resources. Scientific and technological developments resulting from the new cooperative ventures will benefit not only the two countries involved, but will also enhance the welfare and prosperity of the entire world.

"This series of meetings between the Governments of the United States and Japan results from a proposal by President Carter to Prime Minister Ohira that the US and Japan embark on cooperation in research and development in non-energy fields, as a complement to cooperative activities in energy-related fields resulting from a similar Japanese initiative. The first meeting, held in September 1979 in Tokyo, represented the initial formal step towards a coordinated program of US-Japan joint research and development in non-energy fields. This second meeting is a continuation of the

earlier discussion and signifies progress in initiating new joint programs between the two Governments."

## House Issues Innovation Studies

The House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology has just published the proceedings of three hearings it held last year on innovation and productivity. Titles are:

"Government and Innovation: An Engineering Perspective," publication number 39, of hearings held June 5, 1979;

"Productivity and Technical Innovation," number 36, of hearings held July 23, 1979, jointly with the Task Force on Inflation of the Committee on the Budget;

"Government and Innovation," number 53, held July 31-August 3.

Copies are obtainable without charge from: Publications Office, Committee on Science and Technology, US House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515; tel: (202) 225-6275.

## Science & Government Report International Almanac—1978-79

*Nature* calls it: ". . .an essential source of reference for scientific administrators, politicians and students. . ."

*New Scientist* says: ". . .well-informed and . . .certainly well written."

368 pages, hardbound, containing 22 original review articles on science-policy developments in all the major industrialized nations and the major developing nations. Plus, the official texts of important science-policy documents, including the historic speeches at the People's Republic of China National Science Conference, and President Carter's Message to Congress on Science Policy.

Published at \$54 per copy—NOW AVAILABLE TO SGR readers for the reduced price of \$29.50. (A full refund of purchase price will be made if for any reason the volume is returned in good condition.)

To place your order, please fill out the coupon and send to:

**SGR International Almanac**  
PO Box 6226  
Washington, DC 20015

Please send \_\_\_\_\_ copies of SGR International Almanac—1978-79 at the reduced price of \$29.50 per copy.

- check enclosed  
 please bill

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

## Boom Continues in Pop Science Magazines

The turn-of-the-decade boom in pop science magazines is still going strong, but a new spirit of caution seems to be tempering the rush to get into the field.

One long-expected new entry, *Science Illustrated*, a Dutch-produced monthly for the American market, has been aborted, apparently after disappointing marketing studies. Meanwhile, Time Inc. is moving very carefully with the science magazine that it's been tinkering with, off and on, for several years. Following the preparation of at least two prototype issues, the publishing goliath is awaiting the results of test mailings before making a decision on whether to proceed. *Newsweek*, which belongs to the *Washington Post*, is quietly studying a new magazine which, though not a science magazine, would contain a good deal of material on science, technology, and medicine.

For those organizations that jumped into the market within the past year or so, the results have been just fine. *Omni*, produced by Penthouse International, is around the million-a-month mark after 18 months of publication. *Science80*, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, has hit the 400,000 mark after three every-other-month issues, and in April, the AAAS board will consider whether to move the magazine to a monthly schedule. Hearst, which publishes the monthly *Science Digest*, has produced two issues of a full-size "Special edition" science magazine. And, for TV, there's CBS's *Universe*, a new half-hour science show; the network plans to produce six of them, with Walter Cronkite, a longtime science buff, as narrator.

The surge of interest in science extends to Britain,

where the weekly *New Scientist* put on some 10,000 new subscribers last year, bringing its circulation to about 85,000.

There are many opinions about where the new customers are coming from and how durable they will prove to be. Some believe that the market was always there but was foolishly neglected by publishers. Support for this is seen in Time's experience with science-related covers turning out to be top sellers on the newsstands—a factor in Time's interest in studying the possibility of an all-science magazine. Then there are those who believe that post-sputnik improvements in science education have raised scientific literacy to the point where there is now a great mass of teen-agers and young adults who want to know more about research-related matters. That the audience is there, and willing to pay for its science fare, is demonstrated by *Omni*, which, at \$2 per copy, is among the costliest periodicals on the market. Nevertheless, it keeps selling.

## Senate Publishes Patent Hearings

Part I of newly published hearings on patent policy held last year by the Senate Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space may be obtained without charge by sending a self-addressed mailing label to: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, US Senate, Washington, DC 20510; tel: (202) 224-9351. Part II, covering patent hearings held in January, will be available shortly.

---

**Science & Government Report**  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

---

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

